THERE IS NO
STABLE VERSION

The shift does not begin where one would expect it.

It does not emerge from trained actors, politically conscious groups, or even from those already accustomed to managing pressure within institutional frameworks. It appears earlier, at a level where one would still assume fragmentation rather than coordination: among first- and second-year school

children, confronted with exam situations that exceed their capacity for formal control, yet almost immediately transformed into a shared field of response.

Short videos circulate, not as solutions, but as distortions of the problem itself. Questions are reframed into absurdity, difficulty is converted into rhythm, anxiety is neither denied nor resolved but redistributed

through repetition and variation. What takes shape is not distraction, but modulation. A collective state adjusts itself in real time, without central direction, without explicit strategy, and —most strikingly—without any stable subject who could be said to be in control of the process.

The age of the participants matters.

At this stage, identity is not yet stabilized through narrative, ideology, or long-term self-conception. What becomes visible, therefore, is not a developed personality coping with stress, but a more fundamental layer of behavior: the capacity of a system to regulate itself by shifting configurations across a network of loosely connected nodes. The children do not express opinions about their

situation; they alter its intensity. They do not solve the problem; they change the conditions under which it is experienced.

What appears here in a small and seemingly negligible setting scales without qualitative change.

Public sentiment, often described in the language of belief and conviction, behaves less like a collection

of positions and more like a field of variable pressure. Election cycles, media events, economic signals—these do not persuade stable individuals so much as they trigger reconfigurations within a population already predisposed to fluctuation. The apparent solidity of opinion dissolves under closer inspection into sequences of alignment and misalignment, amplification and decay, resonance and

exhaustion.

The vocabulary lags behind the phenomenon.

Terms such as decision, preference, or identity suggest continuity where there is, in fact, constant adjustment. What is registered as a change of mind may be nothing more than a shift in underlying conditions—biological, informational, social—that

temporarily stabilize one configuration over another.

And yet, the frameworks built to address human behavior continue to rely on the assumption of stability.

Political systems speak to citizens as if they were coherent units, capable of maintaining consistent views across time, capable of responding proportionally to arguments, capable of

representing themselves through discrete acts such as voting. But what is being addressed is not a fixed subject; it is a transient alignment of states, a momentary equilibrium within a system that is already in motion. The question is posed to an entity that does not persist long enough to answer it in the terms assumed.

Democracy, in this sense,

speaks to individuals and receives responses from configurations.

This does not invalidate the system. It distorts it in ways that are rarely acknowledged. Outcomes appear inconsistent, volatility increases, trust erodes, and the explanation is often sought in external disruptions—misinformation, polarization, manipulation—while the more basic

misalignment remains unexamined: the gap between a model of stable agency and a reality of continuous reconfiguration.

A parallel misunderstanding unfolds within technological culture, where instability is not ignored but targeted as a problem to be solved.

The language of optimization, personalization, and seamless integration presupposes that

variability can be reduced to manageable parameters. Devices track behavior, platforms anticipate preference, systems adapt interfaces in response to use patterns, all in the service of creating a smoother alignment between intention and execution. The ideal is not merely efficiency, but continuity: a user who remains legible to the system, and a system that responds without visible

interruption.

But optimization requires a stable object.

It assumes that goals remain consistent, that preferences can be aggregated into profiles, that feedback converges toward a definable improvement. Without such stability, optimization becomes a process without endpoint, a continuous recalibration that follows a

moving target. The system does not resolve variability; it chases it, generating the appearance of adaptation while remaining structurally dependent on conditions that cannot be fixed.

The promise of seamlessness conceals this dependency.

What is presented as integration is often the suppression of visible discontinuity. Adjustments

occur, but they are displaced from perception. The seam does not disappear; it is relocated beyond the threshold of awareness. The user encounters a surface that appears continuous, while the underlying system performs constant corrections to maintain that appearance.

Seamless is not the absence of seams. It is a seam one can no longer see.

The consequence is not simply technical. It alters the relation between a system and its own variability.

When discontinuities remain perceptible, they impose a form of friction that demands recognition. One must pause, recalibrate, account for the shift. When they are concealed, variability persists without acknowledgment, and the

system appears more stable than it is. This apparent stability becomes a norm against which deviations are measured, often interpreted as failures of performance rather than as expressions of underlying fluctuation.

In this context, the figure of the analog cyborg does not describe a transitional form between human and machine, nor a nostalgic attachment to imperfect

tools. It designates a condition in which seams remain operative at the level of experience, in which switching is not eliminated but encountered, in which the necessity of adjustment is not fully absorbed into the background.

Manual recalibration, visible compensation, the persistence of friction—these are not inefficiencies to be engineered away, but

indications of how the system functions. They expose the absence of a stable core, the dependence on context, the continuous negotiation between incompatible states.

This applies not only to external behavior, but to the internal structure of what is called the self.

Contradictory tendencies—impulse and restraint,

expansion and contraction, the desire to distinguish oneself and the recognition of interchangeability—do not require resolution into a higher unity. They can be understood as competing configurations, each becoming dominant under specific conditions, each receding as those conditions shift. The expectation of coherence transforms this dynamic into a problem; the absence of that expectation

reveals it as a pattern.

No stable version persists beneath these shifts.

What appears as identity is the temporary stabilization of a configuration that holds only as long as the variables supporting it remain within a certain range. Once those variables change, the configuration dissolves, often without leaving a trace that could justify its previous

sense of permanence.

The search for seamless integration—whether in political systems, technological design, or personal development—can then be seen as an attempt to impose continuity on processes that do not sustain it. It produces surfaces that appear stable, narratives that suggest coherence, models that assume persistence, while the underlying

dynamics remain discontinuous.

Nothing in this process indicates a transition toward a more unified state.

What emerges instead is a more refined management of instability, a capacity to mask fluctuation without eliminating it, to maintain function without resolving contradiction. Systems do not become coherent; they

become more effective at concealing the conditions of their own operation.

The task, if it can be called that, shifts accordingly.

It is no longer a matter of achieving stability, of aligning oneself with a consistent identity, or of integrating seamlessly into technical and social systems. These aims remain available, but they operate at the level of

appearance. Beneath them, the processes continue unchanged.

What becomes possible, instead, is a different form of attention.

Not the search for a stable core, but the recognition of configurations as configurations. Not the elimination of seams, but the perception of where and how they operate. Not the

assumption of continuity, but the registration of shifts as they occur.

One does not become an unstable system.

One ceases to attribute stability to what never possessed it.